

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
ASHEVILLE DIVISION  
CIVIL CASE NO. 1:22-cv-00259-MR**

DAMETRI DALE, )  
Plaintiff, )  
vs. )  
NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT )  
OF PUBLIC SAFETY, et al., )  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_  
)

**THIS MATTER** is before the Court on the Plaintiff's pro se "Motion for a Copy of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint Without the Prepayment of Fees or Costs" [Doc. 24].

The incarcerated Plaintiff, who is proceeding in forma pauperis, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Complaint passed initial review on Eighth Amendment claims against several prison officers and the Court exercised supplemental jurisdiction over a North Carolina assault and battery claim. [Doc. 18 (Order on initial review of the Complaint); see Doc. 18 (Order dismissing the Amended Complaint as abusive)]. Service is underway. [See Doc. 20 (Request for Waiver of Service)].

The Plaintiff presently asks the Court to advance him a copy of his Amended Complaint, and to establish a debt for the Court's copying fee against his inmate account. [Doc. 24].

A plaintiff who is proceeding in forma pauperis is not excused from bearing his own litigation expenses, including the cost of copies. See United States v. MacCollum, 426 U.S. 317, 321 (1976) ("expenditure of public funds [on behalf of an indigent litigant] is proper only when authorized by Congress"); Pickens v. Lewis, 2017 WL 2198342, at \*2 (W.D.N.C. May 18, 2017) (noting that 28 U.S.C. § 1915 does not authorize the payment of litigation expenses and "[o]rdinarily, the plaintiff must bear the costs of his litigation ... even in pro se cases"). The Court is not obligated to advance the Plaintiff funds to cover the same. See, e.g., Easley v. Dep't of Corr., 590 F. App'x 860, 868 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014) (district court was not obligated to advance an inmate the cost of copying discovery materials and place a lien on his prisoner account). The Plaintiff's request that the Court advance him the cost of obtaining photocopies and establish a debt against his inmate account is, therefore, denied.

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that the Plaintiff's "Motion for a Copy of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint Without the Prepayment of Fees or Costs" [Doc. 24] is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed: August 18, 2023



\_\_\_\_\_  
Martin Reidinger  
Chief United States District Judge

